arXiv:1511.05514v1 [cs.DM] 17 Nov 2015

Better *s*-*t*-Tours by Gao Trees

Corinna Gottschalk Jens Vygen

RWTH Aachen University of Bonn

November 17, 2015[1]

Abstract

We consider the *s*-*t*-path TSP: given a finite metric space with two elements s and t, we look for a path from s to t that contains all the elements and has minimum total distance. We improve the approximation ratio for this problem from 1.599 to 1.566. Like previous algorithms, we solve the natural LP relaxation and represent an optimum solution x^* as a convex combination of spanning trees. Gao showed that there exists a spanning tree in the support of x^* that has only one edge in each narrow cut (i.e., each cut C with $x^*(C) < 2$). Our main theorem says that the spanning trees in the convex combination can be chosen such that many of them are such "Gao trees".

keywords: traveling salesman problem, *s*-*t*-path TSP, approximation algorithm, spanning tree

1 Introduction

The traveling salesman problem (TSP) is one of the best-known NP-hard problems in combinatorial optimization. In this paper, we consider the *s*-*t*-path variant: Given a finite set V (of *cities*), two elements $s, t \in V$ and $c : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the goal is to find a sequence $v_1, \ldots, v_N$ containing all cities and with $v_1 = s$ and $v_N = t$, minimizing $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} c(v_i, v_{i+1})$. An equivalent formulation requires that every city is visited exactly once, but then we need to assume that c satisfies the triangle inequality. We work with the latter formulation (to obtain such an instance from a general function c, compute the metric closure). The special case where $s = t$ is the well-known metric TSP; but in this paper we assume $s \neq t$.

The classical algorithm by Christofides [1976] computes a minimum-cost spanning tree (V, S) and then does *parity correction* by adding a minimum-cost matching on the vertices whose degree in S has the wrong parity. While Christofides' algorithm is still the best known approximation algorithm for metric TSP (with ratio $\frac{3}{2}$), there have recently been improvements for special cases and variants (see e.g. Vygen [2012] for a survey), including the *s*-*t*-path TSP.

[1]This work was done during the trimester program on combinatorial optimization at the Hausdorff Institute for Mathematics in Bonn.

1.1 Previous Work

For the s-t-path TSP, Christofides' algorithm has only an approximation ratio of $\frac{5}{3}$ as shown by Hoogeveen [1991]. An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015] were the first to improve on this and obtained an approximation ratio of $\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618$. They first solve the natural LP relaxation (essentially proposed by Dantzig, Fulkerson and Johnson [1954]) and represent an optimum solution x^* as a convex combination of spanning trees. This idea, first proposed by Held and Karp [1970], was exploited earlier for different TSP variants by Asadpour et al. [2010] and Oveis Gharan, Saberi and Singh [2011]. Given this convex combination, An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015] do parity correction for each of the contributing trees and output the best of these solutions. Sebő [2013] improved the analysis of this *best-of-many Christofides algorithm* and obtained the approximation ratio $\frac{8}{5}$. Gao [2015] gave a unified analysis. Vygen [2015] suggested to "reassemble" the trees: starting with an arbitrary convex combination of spanning trees, he computed a different one, still representing x^*, that avoids certain bad local configurations. This led to the slightly better approximation ratio of 1.599.

In this paper, we will reassemble the trees more systematically to obtain a convex combination with strong global properties. This will enable us to control the cost of parity correction much better, leading to an approximation ratio of 1.566.

This also proves an upper bound of 1.566 on the integrality ratio of the natural LP. The only known lower bound is 1.5. Sebő and Vygen [2014] proved that the integrality ratio is indeed 1.5 for the graph s-t-path TSP, i.e., the special case of *graph metrics* (where $c(v,w)$ is the distance from v to w in a given unweighted graph on vertex set V). Gao [2013] gave a simpler proof of this result, which inspired our work: see Section 1.4.

1.2 Notation and Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, V denotes the given set of cities, $n := |V|$, and E denotes the set of edges of the complete graph on V. Moreover, $c : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the given metric. For any $U \subseteq V$ we write $E[U]$ for the set of edges with both endpoints in U and $\delta(U)$ for the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in U; moreover, $\delta(v) := \delta(\{v\})$ for $v \in V$. If $F \subseteq E$ and $U \subseteq V$, we denote by $(V,F)[U]$ the subgraph $(U, F \cap E[U])$ of (V,F) induced by U. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$ we write $c(x) := \sum_{e=\{v,w\}\in E} c(v,w)x_e$ and $x(F) := \sum_{e\in F} x_e$ for $F \subseteq E$. Furthermore, $\chi^F \in \{0,1\}^E$ denotes the characteristic vector of a subset $F \subseteq E$, and $c(F) := c(\chi^F)$. For $F \subset E$ and $f \in E$, we write $F + f$ and $F - f$ for $F \cup \{f\}$ and $F \setminus \{f\}$, respectively.

For $T \subseteq V$ with $|T|$ even, a *T-join* is a set $J \subseteq E$ for which $|\delta(v) \cap J|$ is odd if and only if $v \in T$. Edmonds [1965] proved that a minimum weight T-join can be computed in polynomial time. Moreover, the minimum cost of a T-join is the minimum over $c(y)$ for y in the *T-join polyhedron* $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0} : y(\delta(U)) \geq 1 \ \forall U \subset V \text{ with } |U \cap T| \text{ odd}\}$ as proved by Edmonds and Johnson [1973]. We are going to use that the cost of any vector in the T-join polyhedron is an upper bound for the minimum cost of a T-join.

To obtain a solution for the s-t-path TSP, it is sufficient to compute a connected multi-graph with vertex set V in which exactly s and t have odd degree. We call such a graph an $\{s,t\}$-*tour*. As an $\{s,t\}$-tour contains an Eulerian walk from s to t, we can obtain a *Hamiltonian* s-t-path (i.e. an s-t-path with vertex set V) by traversing the Eulerian walk and shortcutting when the walk encounters a vertex that has been visited already. Since c is a metric, it obeys the triangle inequality. Thus, the resulting path is not more expensive than the multigraph.
By $\mathcal{S}$ we denote the set of edge sets of spanning trees in (V,E). For $S \in \mathcal{S}$, T_S denotes the set of vertices whose degree has the wrong parity, i.e., even for s or t and odd for $v \in V \setminus \{s,t\}$. Christofides' algorithm computes an $S \in \mathcal{S}$ with minimum $c(S)$ and adds a T_S-join J with minimum $c(J)$.

1.3 Best-of-Many Christofides

Like An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015], we begin by solving the natural LP relaxation:

$$\begin{array}{lrcll} \min & c(x) & & & \\ \text{subject to} & x(\delta(U)) & \geq & 2 & (\emptyset \neq U \subset V,\ |U \cap \{s,t\}| \text{ even}) \\ & x(\delta(U)) & \geq & 1 & (\emptyset \neq U \subset V,\ |U \cap \{s,t\}| \text{ odd}) \\ & x(\delta(v)) & = & 2 & (v \in V \setminus \{s,t\}) \\ & x(\delta(v)) & = & 1 & (v \in \{s,t\}) \\ & x_e & \geq & 0 & (e \in E) \end{array} \tag{1}$$

whose integral solutions are precisely the incidence vectors of the edge sets of the Hamiltonian s-t-paths in (V,E). This LP can be solved in polynomial time (either by the ellipsoid method (Grötschel, Lovász and Schrijver [1981]) or an extended formulation). Let x^* be an optimum solution. Then, x^* (in fact every feasible solution) can be written as convex combination of spanning trees, i.e. as $x^* = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$, where p is a *distribution* on $\mathcal{S}$, i.e., $p_S \geq 0$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S = 1$.
By Carathéodory's theorem, we can assume that $p_S > 0$ for less than n^2 spanning trees (V,S). Such spanning trees and numbers p_S can be computed in polynomial time, using either the ellipsoid method or the splitting-off technique (cf. Genova and Williamson [2015]).
The best-of-many Christofides algorithm does the following: Compute an optimum solution x^* for (1) and obtain a distribution p with $x^* = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$ as above. For each tree (V,S) with $p_S > 0$, compute a minimum weight T_S-join J_S. Then, the multigraph $(V, S \dot\cup J_S)$ is an $\{s,t\}$-tour. We output the best of these.
We will fix x^* henceforth. An important concept in An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015] and the subsequent works are the so-called *narrow cuts*, i.e., the cuts $C = \delta(U)$ with $x^*(C) < 2$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of all narrow cuts. We are going to exploit their structure as well.

Lemma 1 (An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015]) *The narrow cuts form a chain: there are sets* $\{s\} = U_0 \subset U_1 \subset \cdots \subset U_{\ell-1} \subset U_\ell = V \setminus \{t\}$ *so that* $\mathcal{C} = \{\delta(U_i) : i = 0, \ldots, \ell\}$. *These sets can be computed in polynomial time.*

We number the narrow cuts $\mathcal{C} = \{C_0, C_1 \ldots, C_\ell\}$ with $C_i = \delta(U_i)$ $(i = 0, \ldots, \ell)$.

1.4 Gao trees

Our work was inspired by the following idea of Gao [2013]:

Theorem 2 (Gao [2013]) *There exists a spanning tree* $S \in \mathcal{S}$ *with* $x^*_e > 0$ *for all* $e \in S$ *and* $|C \cap S| = 1$ *for all* $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

In fact, Gao [2013] showed this for any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$ with $x(\delta(U)) \geq 1$ for all $\emptyset \neq U \subset V$ and $x(\delta(U)) \geq 2$ for all $\emptyset \neq U \subset V$ with $|U \cap \{s, t\}|$ even. For graph s-t-path TSP, one uses only variables corresponding to edges of the given graph. Then every spanning tree has cost $n-1$. The approximation guarantee of $\frac{3}{2}$ then follows from the fact that for a tree (V, S) with $|S \cap C| = 1$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, the vector $\frac{1}{2}x^*$ is in the T_S-join polyhedron. But, as shown by Gao [2015], for the general s-t-path TSP there may be no tree as in Theorem 2 whose cost is bounded by the LP value.

Let us call a tree $S \in \mathcal{S}$ a *local Gao tree at* C if $|C \cap S| = 1$. We call S a *global Gao tree* if it is a local Gao tree at every narrow cut.

An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015] and Sebő [2013] observed that for every distribution p with $x^* = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$ and every narrow cut $C \in \mathcal{C}$, at least a $2 - x^*(C)$ fraction of the trees will be local Gao trees at C. However, in general none of these trees will be a global Gao tree.

1.5 Our contribution

Our main contribution is a new structural result: Starting from an arbitrary distribution of trees representing x^*, we can compute a new distribution in which a sufficient number of trees are Gao trees simultaneously for all sufficiently narrow cuts. For example, if $x^*(C) = \frac{3}{2}$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, at least half of our new distribution will be made of global Gao trees. Here is our main structure theorem:

Theorem 3 *For every feasible solution* x^* *of (1), there are* $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ *and* $p_1, \ldots, p_r > 0$ *with* $\sum_{j=1}^r p_j = 1$ *such that* $x^* = \sum_{j=1}^r p_j \chi^{S_j}$ *and for every* $C \in \mathcal{C}$ *there exists a* $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ *with* $\sum_{j=1}^k p_j \geq 2 - x^*(C)$ *and* $|C \cap S_j| = 1$ *for all* $j = 1, \ldots, k$.

Note that this result immediately implies Theorem 2, simply by taking S_1.

However, we do not know whether such a distribution can be computed in polynomial time (or even whether r can be polynomially bounded). Therefore we will start with an arbitrary distribution p

and round the coefficients down to integral multiples of $\frac{\epsilon}{n^3}$ for a sufficiently small constant $\epsilon > 0$. This way we will get a vector x close to x^* that we can write as $x = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{1}{r}\chi^{S_j}$, where $r \leq \frac{n^3}{\epsilon}$ and $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$. We will work with x in the following and consider the rounding error in Section 3. We will show that $x \in \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$ satisfies the properties

$$x(\delta(s)) = x(\delta(t)) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad x^*(F) - \epsilon \leq x(F) \leq x^*(F) + \epsilon \text{ for all } F \subseteq E. \tag{2}$$

Theorem 4 *Given $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$, a feasible solution x^* of (1) and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} \chi^{S_j}$ satisfies (2), we can find $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r \in \mathcal{S}$ in polynomial time such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} \chi^{\hat{S}_j}$, and for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists an $h \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ with $\frac{h}{r} \geq 2 - x^*(C) - \epsilon$ and $|C \cap \hat{S}_j| = 1$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, h$.*

Note that this theorem implies Theorem 3, by letting $\epsilon = 0$ and $x = x^* = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{1}{r}\chi^{S_j}$ where all p_S are integer multiples of $\frac{1}{r}$ for some (possibly exponentially large) natural number r and taking rp_S copies of each $S \in \mathcal{S}$.
This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we will prove Theorem 4. In Section 3, we will analyze the best-of-many Christofides algorithm on the resulting distribution. Finally, in Section 4 we provide the computations needed to obtain the approximation guarantee of 1.566.

2 Proof of the Structure Theorem

We will prove Theorem 4 by starting with arbitrary trees $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ with $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} \chi^{S_j}$ satisfying (2), and successively exchange a pair of edges in two of the trees. We will first satisfy the properties for the first tree S_1, then for S_2, and so on. For each S_j, we will work on the narrow cuts $C_1, \ldots, C_{\ell-1}$ in this order; note that $|C_0 \cap S_j| = |C_\ell \cap S_j| = 1$ always holds for all $j = 1, \ldots, r$ due to the first property in (2).
In the following we write

$$\theta_i := \lceil r(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon) \rceil$$

for $i = 0, \ldots, \ell$. Note that $\theta_0 \geq \theta_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ because $x^*(C_i) \geq 1 = x^*(C_0) = x^*(\delta(s))$. Our goal is to obtain $|S_j \cap C_i| = 1$ whenever $j \leq \theta_i$.
Note that $|S_j \cap C_i| = 1$ implies that $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ is connected, and we will first obtain this weaker property by Lemma 9, before obtaining $|S_j \cap C_i| = 1$ by Lemma 10.
We need a few preparations.

Lemma 5 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{S_{j'}}$ satisfies (2). Let $0 \leq h < i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$ with $j \leq \theta_h$ and $j \leq \theta_i$. Let $M = U_i \setminus U_h$ or $M = U_i$. Then there exists an index $k \geq j$ such that $(V, S_k)[M]$ is connected.*

Proof: Assume the above is not true. Then $|E[M] \cap S_{j'}| \leq |M| - 1$ for all $j' < j$, and $|E[M] \cap S_{j'}| \leq |M| - 2$ for $j' \geq j$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} x(E[M]) &= \tfrac{1}{r} \textstyle\sum_{j'=1}^{r} |E[M] \cap S_{j'}| \\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{r}\big((j-1)(|M|-1) + (r-j+1)(|M|-2)\big) = |M| - 2 + \tfrac{j-1}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using (2) we have $x(E[M]) + \epsilon \geq x^*(E[M]) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\sum_{v \in M} x^*(\delta(v)) - x^*(\delta(M))\big)$. If $M = U_i \setminus U_h$, this is equal to $|M| - \frac{1}{2}(x^*(C_h) + x^*(C_i)) + x^*(C_h \cap C_i) \geq |M| - \frac{1}{2}(x^*(C_h) + x^*(C_i))$. If $M = U_i$, this is equal to $|M| - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}x^*(C_i) = |M| - \frac{1}{2}(1 + x^*(C_i))$.
Now, $j \leq \theta_i$ and $j \leq \theta_h$ implies $1 \leq x^*(C_i) < 2 - \frac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon$ and $x^*(C_h) < 2 - \frac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon$. Thus,

$$x(E[M]) > -\epsilon + |M| - \tfrac{1}{2}(2 - \tfrac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon + 2 - \tfrac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon) = |M| - 2 + \tfrac{j-1}{r},$$

a contradiction. □

Lemma 6 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{S_{j'}}$ satisfies (2). Let $0 \leq h < i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$ with $j \leq \theta_h$ and $j \leq \theta_i$. Then there exists an index $k \geq j$ such that $S_k \cap C_h \cap C_i = \emptyset$.*

Proof: Using first (2) and then $x^*(C_{i'}) < 2 - \frac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon$ for $i' \in \{h, i\}$ and $x^*(U) \geq 2$ for $|U \cap \{s,t\}|$ even, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x(C_h \cap C_i) - \epsilon \leq x^*(C_h \cap C_i) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\big(x^*(C_h) + x^*(C_i) - x^*(\delta(U_i \setminus U_h))\big) \\ &< 2 - \tfrac{j-1}{r} - \epsilon - 1 = \tfrac{r-j+1}{r} - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} |S_{j'} \cap C_h \cap C_i| = x(C_h \cap C_i) < \frac{r-j+1}{r}$, i.e. at most $r - j$ trees can contain an edge in $C_h \cap C_i$. □

Lemma 7 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{S_{j'}}$ satisfies (2). Let $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $j \leq \theta_i$ with $|C_i \cap S_j| \geq 2$. Then there exists an index $k > \theta_i$ with $|C_i \cap S_k| = 1$.*

Proof: Suppose there exists no such k. Then we get $rx(C_i) = \sum_{j'=1}^{r} |C_i \cap S_{j'}| \geq (r - \theta_i + 1)2 + \theta_i - 1 = 2r - \lceil r(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon)\rceil + 1 > 2r - r(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon) = r(x^*(C_i) + \epsilon)$, which is a contradiction to (2). □

Lemma 8 *Let $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $M \subseteq U_i$ and $S_j, S_k \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $(V, S_j)[M]$ is disconnected and $(V, S_k)[M]$ is connected and $|S_j \cap \delta(U_i \setminus M)| \leq 1$. Then there exist edges $e \in S_j$ and $f \in S_k$ such that $S_j - e + f \in \mathcal{S}$ and $S_k + e - f \in \mathcal{S}$ and $e \notin E[U_i]$ and $f \in E[M]$.*



Figure 1: Tree S_j in green, S_k in red/bold. In this example one can choose $p = 1$. Note that e could belong to C_i (but not to $\delta(U_i \setminus M)$).

Proof: An illustration of the following proof can be found in Figure 1. Let $A_1, \dots, A_q$ be the vertex sets of the connected components of $(V, S_j)[M]$; note that $q \geq 2$.
Let $F := S_k \cap \bigcup_{p=1}^{q} (\delta(A_p) \setminus \delta(M))$ be the set of edges of S_k between the sets $A_1, \dots, A_q$. Note that $F \subseteq E[M]$. For $p = 1, \dots, q$ let B_p be the set of vertices reachable from A_p in $(V, S_k \setminus F)$. Trivially, $A_p \subseteq B_p$ for all p, and $\{B_1, \dots, B_q\}$ is a partition of V because $(V, S_k)[M]$ is connected and (V, S_k) is a tree. Let Y be the union of the edge sets of the unique v-w-paths in S_j for all $v, w \in M$. Note that $Y \subseteq E[V \setminus (U_i \setminus M)]$ because $|S_j \cap \delta(U_i \setminus M)| \leq 1$.

Claim: There exists an index $p \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and an edge $e \in Y \cap \delta(B_p)$ such that for every $p' \in \{1, \dots, q\} \setminus \{p\}$ the path in S_j from A_p to $A_{p'}$ contains e.

To prove the Claim, note that (V, Y) consists of a tree and possibly isolated vertices. Choose an arbitrary root z in this tree and take an edge $e \in Y \cap \bigcup_{p'=1}^{q} \delta(B_{p'})$ with maximum distance from z.
Let $D := \{v \in V : e \text{ is on the } z\text{-}v\text{-path in } (V, Y)\}$. We will show that $D \cap M = A_p$ for some $p \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. This will immediately imply that p and e satisfy the properties of the Claim.
Observe that $D \cap M \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in D \cap M$ and p such that $v \in A_p$. Since $(V, S_j)[A_p]$ is connected, this implies $A_p \subseteq D$. $(D, Y \cap E[D])$ is a tree and by the choice of e, it contains no edge from $\bigcup_{p'=1}^{q} \delta(B_{p'})$. Therefore, $D \subseteq B_p$ and hence, $D \cap M = A_p$. The Claim is proved.
Now, take an index p and an edge e as in the Claim. Consider the path P in S_k that connects the endpoints of e. Since $e \in \delta(B_p)$, P has an edge $f \in \delta(B_p) \cap S_k = \delta(A_p) \cap F$. Thus, $(V, S_k + e - f)$

is a tree. The path in S_j that connects the endpoints of f contains e by the Claim. Thus, $(V, S_j - e + f)$ is a tree. We have $f \in E[M]$ since $f \in F$, and $e \notin E[U_i]$ as $e \in Y \cap \delta(B_p)$. □

Now we are ready to prove our main lemmas:

Lemma 9 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{S_{j'}}$ satisfies (2). Let $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ such that $j \leq \theta_i$ and $|S_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h < i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$. Then we can find $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r \in \mathcal{S}$ in polynomial time such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{\hat{S}_{j'}}$ and $\hat{S}_{j'} = S_{j'}$ for all $j' < j$ and $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h < i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$, and $(V, \hat{S}_j)[U_i]$ is connected.*

Proof: Assume that $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ is disconnected, i.e., $|S_j \cap E[U_i]| < |U_i| - 1$. Let h be the largest index smaller than i with $j \leq \theta_h$. Such an index must exist because $\theta_0 \geq \theta_i \geq j$.

Case 1: $|S_j \cap E[U_i \setminus U_h]| < |U_i \setminus U_h| - 1$.
Let $M := U_i \setminus U_h$. Note that $|S_j \cap \delta(U_i \setminus M)| = |S_j \cap C_h| = 1$. Since $(V, S_j)[M]$ is not connected, by Lemma 5 there exists an index $k > j$ such that $(V, S_k)[M]$ is connected.
Now we apply Lemma 8 and obtain two trees $\hat{S}_j := S_j - e + f$ and $\hat{S}_k := S_k + e - f$ with $e \notin E[U_i]$ and $f \in E[M]$.
We have $|\hat{S}_j \cap E[U_i]| = |S_j \cap E[U_i]| + 1$ and $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_{h'}| \leq |S_j \cap C_{h'}|$ for all $h' \leq h$ and hence $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_{h'}| = 1$ for $h' \leq h$ with $j \leq \theta_{h'}$. Note that $j > \theta_{i'}$ for all $h < i' < i$, so a new edge f in such cuts $C_{i'}$ does no harm.
We replace S_j and S_k by $\hat{S}_j$ and $\hat{S}_k$ and leave the other trees unchanged. If $(V, \hat{S}_j)[U_i]$ is still not connected, we iterate.

Case 2: $|S_j \cap E[U_i \setminus U_h]| = |U_i \setminus U_h| - 1$.
$(V, S_j)[U_h]$ is connected since $|S_j \cap C_h| = 1$. Moreover, $(V, S_j)[U_i \setminus U_h]$ is connected, but $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ is disconnected. Therefore, S_j must contain an edge in $C_i \cap C_h$ and $S_j \cap C_h \subset S_j \cap C_i$ and $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ has exactly two connected components: U_h and $U_i \setminus U_h$. We will illustrate the following in Figure 2.
Case 2a: $h > 0$. Let g be the largest index smaller than h with $j \leq \theta_g$. Set $M := U_i \setminus U_g$. Note that $|S_j \cap \delta(U_i \setminus M)| = |S_j \cap C_g| = 1$. By Lemma 5 there exists an index $k \geq j$ with $(V, S_k)[M]$ connected. As $(V, S_j)[M]$ is not connected, we have $k > j$.
Case 2b: $h = 0$. Set $M := U_i$. Note that $|S_j \cap \delta(U_i \setminus M)| = |S_j \cap \delta(\emptyset)| = 0$. By Lemma 5, there exists an index $k \geq j$ such that $(V, S_k)[M]$ is connected. Since $(V, S_j)[M]$ is not connected, $k > j$.
Note that in both cases 2a and 2b, $(V, S_j)[M]$ is disconnected. Now we apply Lemma 8 and obtain two trees $\hat{S}_j := S_j - e + f$ and $\hat{S}_k := S_k + e - f$ with $e \notin E[U_i]$ and $f \in E[M]$. We replace S_j and S_k by $\hat{S}_j$ and $\hat{S}_k$ and leave the other trees unchanged. Then $(V, \hat{S}_j)[U_i]$ is connected. We have $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_{h'}| = 1$ for all $h' < h$ with $j \leq \theta_{h'}$, but we may have $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_h| = 2$.
Assume $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_h| = 2$ (otherwise we are done). Then $\hat{S}_j \cap C_h \cap C_i = S_j \cap C_h \cap C_i = S_j \cap C_h$, and this set contains precisely one edge $\hat{e} = \{v, w\}$ (where $v \in U_h$ and $w \in V \setminus U_i$). By Lemma 6 there exists an index $k' > j$ with $\hat{S}_{k'} \cap C_h \cap C_i = \emptyset$.



Figure 2: Tree S_j in green, $\hat{S}_{k'}$ in red/bold. The dashed edge f is added to S_j by applying Lemma 8.

Let W be the set of vertices reachable from w in $(V, \hat{S}_j \setminus C_i)$. Since $(V, \hat{S}_j)[U_i]$ is connected, $\hat{S}_j \cap \delta(W) = \{\hat{e}\}$. The unique path in $(V, \hat{S}_{k'})$ from v to w contains at least one edge $\hat{f} \in \delta(W)$. Note that $\hat{f} \notin C_h$ by the choice of $\hat{S}_{k'}$. We replace $\hat{S}_j$ and $\hat{S}_{k'}$ by $\hat{\hat{S}}_j := \hat{S}_j - \hat{e} + \hat{f}$ and $\hat{\hat{S}}_{k'} := \hat{S}_{k'} + \hat{e} - \hat{f}$. Then $(V, \hat{\hat{S}}_j)[U_i]$ is still connected and $|\hat{\hat{S}}_j \cap C_{h'}| = 1$ for all $h' < i$ with $j \leq \theta_{h'}$. □

Lemma 10 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{S_{j'}}$ satisfies (2). Let $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $j \leq \theta_i$ such that $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ is connected and $|S_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h < i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$. Then we can find $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r \in \mathcal{S}$ in polynomial time such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j'=1}^{r} \chi^{\hat{S}_{j'}}$ and $\hat{S}_{j'} = S_{j'}$ for all $j' < j$ and $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h \leq i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$.*

Proof: Suppose $|S_j \cap C_i| \geq 2$. Then by Lemma 7 there exists an index $k > \theta_i$ with $|S_k \cap C_i| = 1$. We will swap a pair of edges, reducing $|S_j \cap C_i|$ and increasing $|S_k \cap C_i|$ while maintaining the other properties. An illustration of the following construction is given in Figure 3.
Let $S_k \cap C_i = \{\{x, y\}\}$ with $x \in U_i$ and $y \in V \setminus U_i$. Let A be the set of vertices reachable from y in $(V, S_j \setminus C_i)$. Note that $A \cap U_i = \emptyset$. We have $|\delta(A) \cap S_j \cap C_i| = 1$ because $(V, S_j)[U_i]$ is connected. So let $e = \{v, w\} \in (S_j \cap C_i) \setminus \delta(A)$, with $v \in U_i$ and $w \in V \setminus U_i$. Let B be the set of vertices reachable from w in $(V, S_j \setminus C_i)$. We have $w \in B$, $y \in A$, and $A \cap B = \emptyset$ by the choice of e. Consider the path P in S_k from w to y. Note that P does not contain any vertex in U_i because $|C_i \cap S_k| = 1$. But P contains at least one edge $f \in \delta(B)$.
We will swap e and f. Since $S_k \cap C_i = \{\{x, y\}\}$, the w-v-path in S_k contains P. Therefore, $\hat{S}_k := S_k + e - f$ is a tree. On the other hand, the path in S_j connecting the endpoints of f must use an edge in $\delta(B)$. Since $S_j \cap E[U_i]$ is connected and $S_j \cap (\delta(B) \setminus C_i) = \emptyset$, e is the only edge in $\delta(B) \cap S_j$ and thus, $\hat{S}_j := S_j + f - e$ is a tree.



Figure 3: Tree S_j in green, S_k in red/bold

Since $f \in E[V \setminus U_i]$ and $e \in C_i$, we have $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_i| = |S_j \cap C_i| - 1$ and $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_h| = |S_j \cap C_h|$ for all $h < i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$. Moreover, $(V, \hat{S}_j)[U_i]$ is still connected. As before, we replace S_j and S_k by $\hat{S}_j$ and $\hat{S}_k$ and leave the other trees unchanged. If $|\hat{S}_j \cap C_i| > 1$, we iterate. □

Now the proof of Theorem 4 is a simple induction. We scan the indices of the trees $j = 1, \dots, r$ in this order. For each j, we consider all narrow cuts C_i with $j \leq \theta_i$. Since x satisfies (2), we always have $|S_j \cap C_0| = 1$ and $|S_j \cap C_\ell| = 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, r$. Now let $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ with $j \leq \theta_i$. Assuming $|S_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h < i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$, we first apply Lemma 9 and then Lemma 10. The new tree then satisfies $|S_j \cap C_h| = 1$ for all $h \leq i$ with $j \leq \theta_h$, and $S_1, \dots S_{j-1}$ remain unchanged.

3 Analysis of the Approximation Ratio

In this section, we will explain and analyze the algorithm that was sketched in Section 1. As mentioned before, we use the best-of-many Christofides algorithm on a special distribution of trees. To obtain these trees, we start with an optimal solution x^* of the LP (1) and a distribution p with $x^* = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$ and round down the coefficients to integer multiples of $\frac{\epsilon}{n^3}$. By taking multiple copies of trees, we will obtain trees $S_1, \dots, S_r$ on which we can apply Theorem 4. Now, there is a small contribution of trees that is lost due to the rounding error. We will deal with these separately in the analysis and use that they can only represent a small fraction of x^*. Best-of-many Christofides will then be applied to the union of the trees constructed by Theorem 4 (we will call the set of these trees $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$) and the "leftover" trees. How exactly we deal with rounding will be explained in the proof of Theorem 14.
Our goal is to choose for each tree S a cheap vector y^S in the T_S-join polyhedron to bound the cost of parity correction for S. Clearly, $y^S = x^*$ is a possible choice as $x^*(\delta(U)) \geq 1$ for all $\emptyset \neq U \subset V$. But for the trees in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$, we will construct better vectors.

We follow the analysis of Vygen [2015] (based on An, Kleinberg and Shmoys [2015] and Sebő [2013]). Every tree $S \in \mathcal{S}$ can be partitioned into the edge set I_S of the s-t-path in S and J_S, which is a T_S-join. For any narrow cut $C \in \mathcal{C}$ let $e_C \in C$ be a minimum cost edge in C. We will choose numbers $0 \leq \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq \gamma_S \leq 1$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ later. Then, for $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we set

$$z^S := \sum_{e \in I_S} (1-2\beta)\gamma_S \chi^{\{e\}} + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} : |S \cap C| \text{ even}} \max\{0, (\beta(2 - x^*(C) - \epsilon) - (1-2\beta)\gamma_S)\} \chi^{\{e_C\}}. \quad (3)$$

and

$$y^S := \beta(1+\epsilon)x^* + (1-2\beta)\chi^{J_S} + z^S. \quad (4)$$

Observe that $z^S(C) \geq \beta(2 - x^*(C) - \epsilon)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|S \cap C|$ even. This implies that each y^S is in the T_S-join polyhedron, because $|\delta(U) \cap S|$ even $\Leftrightarrow |U \cap T_S|$ odd holds for all $U \subset V$ with $|U \cap \{s,t\}| = 1$. We adapt Definition 6 and Lemma 7 of Vygen [2015] as follows.

Definition 11 *Given numbers $0 \leq \gamma_S \leq 1$ for $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, we define the* benefit *of $(S, C) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C}$ to be $b_{S,C} := \min\left\{\frac{\beta(2-x^*(C)-\epsilon)}{1-2\beta}, \gamma_S\right\}$ if $|S \cap C|$ is even, $b_{S,C} := 1 - \gamma_S$ if $|S \cap C| = 1$, and $b_{S,C} = 0$ otherwise.*

Lemma 12 *Let $0 \leq \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq \gamma_S \leq 1$ for $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Let p be an arbitrary distribution over $\mathcal{S}$ and $x = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$. If*

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S b_{S,C} \geq \frac{\beta(2 - x^*(C) - \epsilon)(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S} : |S \cap C| even} p_S)}{1 - 2\beta} \quad (5)$$

for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, then $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(y^S) \leq (\beta + \epsilon\beta)c(x^*) + (1-2\beta)c(x)$.

Proof: First we note that $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(z^S) \leq (1-2\beta) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(I_S)$ is proved exactly as in the proof of Lemma 7 in Vygen [2015]. The claim then follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(y^S) &= \beta(1+\epsilon)c(x^*) + (1-2\beta) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(J_S) + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(z^S) \\ &\leq \beta(1+\epsilon)c(x^*) + (1-2\beta) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p_S c(S). \end{aligned}$$

□

We now show how to set the γ-constants in order to maximize the benefits, with the ultimate goal to choose β as large as possible. Sebő [2013] set all γ_S to $\frac{1}{2}$. But we designed our r trees in such a way that the trees with small indices have only one edge in narrow cuts, thus trees that have an even number edges in a narrow cut tend to have larger indices. For example, for a narrow cut

C with $x(C) = \frac{3}{2}$, trees with index $\leq \frac{r}{2}$ have one edge in C (thus it is better to choose a smaller γ_S for these). On the other hand, the trees that have an even number of edges in C will have an index $> \frac{r}{2}$, and for those it is better to choose a bigger γ_S. Therefore we set $\gamma_S = \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ for the first half of the trees and $\gamma_S = 1 - \delta > \frac{1}{2}$ for the second half. More precisely:

Lemma 13 *Let $S_1, \ldots, S_r \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} \chi^{S_j}$ satisfies (2), r is even, and for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists an $h \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ with $\frac{h}{r} \geq 2 - x^*(C) - \epsilon$ and $|C \cap S_j| = 1$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, h$.*
We set $\delta := 0.126$, and $\gamma_{S_j} = \delta$ if $j \leq \frac{r}{2}$ and $\gamma_{S_j} = 1 - \delta$ otherwise. Choose β such that $\frac{\beta}{1-2\beta} = 3.327$. Then

$$\tfrac{1}{r}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i} \;\geq\; 3.327\,(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon)\,\tfrac{1}{r}|\{j : |S_j \cap C_i| \text{ even}\}| \tag{6}$$

for all $i = 0, \ldots, \ell$.

As the proof is quite technical, we prove this lemma in Section 4.
Using Lemma 12 and 13, we can show that the best-of-many Christofides algorithm run on the trees constructed in Theorem 4 and the trees remaining after rounding is a $2-\beta+\epsilon$-approximation for β as in Lemma 12 and obtain:

Theorem 14 *There is a 1.566-approximation algorithm for the s-t-path TSP.*

Proof: Let x^* be an optimal solution for (1) and p a distribution over $\mathcal{S}$ with $x^* = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p_S \chi^S$ such that $p_S > 0$ for at most n^2 trees S. As mentioned before, x^* and p can be found in polynomial time. Setting $p'_S := \frac{\epsilon}{n^3}\lfloor \frac{n^3}{\epsilon} p_S \rfloor$ and $p''_S := p_S - p'_S$ for $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S \leq \frac{\epsilon}{n}$ since $|\{S \in \mathcal{S} : p_S > 0\}| \leq n^2$. By setting $r = \frac{2n^3}{\epsilon}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S$ (an even integer), we can obtain r trees $S_1, \ldots, S_r$, such that each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ appears $2\lfloor \frac{n^3}{\epsilon} p_S \rfloor$ times in this list.
Let $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} \chi^{S_j}$. We show that x fulfills property (2). Since all trees (V, S) with $p_S > 0$ have $|\delta(s) \cap S| = |\delta(t) \cap S| = 1$, we have $x(\delta(s)) = x(\delta(t)) = 1$. It remains to show $x^*(F) - \epsilon \leq x(F) \leq x^*(F) + \epsilon$ for all $F \subseteq E$:

$$\begin{aligned}
x(F) - x^*(F) &= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \Big(\tfrac{p'_S}{\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S} - p_S \Big) |S \cap F| \\
&= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{p_S - p''_S - (1 - \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S) p_S}{1 - \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S} |S \cap F| \\
&= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} \Big(-p''_S + p_S \textstyle\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S \Big) \dfrac{|S \cap F|}{1 - \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|S \cap F| \leq |S| = n-1$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $x(F) - x^*(F) \leq \big(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\big)\big(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} (p_S \frac{|S\cap F|}{1-\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S})\big) \leq \frac{\frac{\epsilon}{n}(n-1)}{1-\frac{\epsilon}{n}} \leq \epsilon$.

Similarly, $x(F) - x^*(F) \geq -\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S \frac{|S\cap F|}{1-\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S} \geq -\frac{\frac{\epsilon}{n}(n-1)}{1-\frac{\epsilon}{n}} \geq -\epsilon$.
This shows (2).
Using Theorem 4 we transform this list to $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r$ fulfilling the statement of the theorem. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 13 to $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r$ and x and obtain inequality (5) for $\frac{\beta}{1-2\beta} = 3.327$. Thus, we will be able to apply Lemma 12 in the analysis.
Our algorithm does parity correction for each of $\hat{S}_1, \ldots, \hat{S}_r$ and for all trees S with $p''_S > 0$ and returns the best resulting tour. We obtain a bound on the value of the best output by an averaging argument. For that, we use $y^{\hat{S}_j}$ as defined above in (4) to bound the parity correction cost for trees $\hat{S}_j$ and x^* for other trees.
We have $x = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^r \chi^{\hat{S}_j} = \frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^r \chi^{S_j} = \frac{1}{\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S\chi^S$. Therefore,

$$c(x) = \frac{1}{\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S c(S) \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p_S c(S) = \frac{1}{\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S} c(x^*). \tag{7}$$

Then, using Lemma 12 in $(*)$ and (7) in $(**)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min\left\{\min_{j=1}^r\big(c(\hat{S}_j) + c(y^{\hat{S}_j})\big), \min_{S\in\mathcal{S}:p''_S>0}\big(c(S)+c(x^*)\big)\right\}\\
&\leq \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S \sum_{j=1}^r \tfrac{1}{r}\big(c(\hat{S}_j) + c(y^{\hat{S}_j})\big) + \textstyle\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\big(c(S)+c(x^*)\big)\\
&= \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S c(S) + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S \sum_{j=1}^r \tfrac{1}{r} c(y^{S_j}) + \textstyle\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S c(S) + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S c(x^*)\\
&= \Big(1 + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\Big)c(x^*) + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S \sum_{j=1}^r \tfrac{1}{r} c(y^{S_j})\\
&\overset{(*)}{\leq} \Big(1 + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\Big)c(x^*) + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S\big((\beta+\epsilon\beta)c(x^*) + (1-2\beta)c(x)\big)\\
&\overset{(**)}{\leq} \Big(1 + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\Big)c(x^*) + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p'_S(\beta+\epsilon\beta)c(x^*) + (1-2\beta)c(x^*)\\
&\leq \Big(2 - \beta + \epsilon\beta + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S\Big)c(x^*)\\
&< (2-\beta+\epsilon)c(x^*).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we used $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}} p''_S \leq \frac{\epsilon}{n}$. Moreover, $\frac{\beta}{1-2\beta} = 3.327$ is equivalent to $\beta = \frac{3.327}{7.654} > 0.434 + 0.0006$.
Thus, for $\epsilon \leq 0.0006$, our approximation ratio is at most $2 - 0.434 = 1.566$. □

4 Computing the Benefit

In this section we prove Lemma 13.
Fix $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$. We write $\xi := x^*(C_i) + \epsilon$, $\pi := \frac{1}{r}|\{j : |S_j \cap C_i| \text{ even}\}|$, and $\rho := \frac{1}{r}\theta_i - (2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon)$. That means ρr is the amount of θ_i due to rounding up (remember that $\theta_i = \lceil r(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon)\rceil$). We have $\pi \le x(C_i) - 1 \le x^*(C_i) + \epsilon - 1 = \xi - 1$: The first inequality follows from $x(C_i) \ge \frac{1}{r}(|\{S_j : |C_i \cap S_j| \ge 2\}| + r) \ge \pi + 1$, the second is due to (2).
Clearly, (6) holds if $\pi = 0$ or $\xi \ge 2$, thus we assume this is not true.
Suppose $3.327(2 - \xi) \le \delta$. Consequently, $b_{S_j,C_i} = \frac{\beta(2-\xi)}{1-2\beta} = 3.327(2 - \xi)$ for all j with $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even. Thus, (6) trivially holds and we assume from now on $3.327(2 - \xi) > \delta$. For convenience of notation, we define $\mu = \min\{1 - \delta, 3.327(2 - \xi)\}$.
First note that among the trees S_j with $j > \theta_i$, we either have trees with $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even or additional trees with $|S_j \cap C_i| = 1$, which will guarantee us a certain amount of benefit: If there is an f fraction of trees S_j with $|S_j \cap C_i| \ge 3$, then $3f + (1 - f) + \pi \le x(C_i) \le x^*(C_i) + \epsilon = \xi$, so $f \le \frac{\xi - \pi - 1}{2}$.
Let us distinguish several cases.

Case 1: $\xi \le \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\theta_i \ge \frac{r}{2}$, and the first half of the trees have only one edge in C_i.
We have $3.327(2 - \xi) \ge 3.327 \cdot \frac{1}{2} > 1 - \delta$. Therefore, $\mu = 1 - \delta$. Considering all trees, we obtain the following lower bounds for the benefit:

j	$\lvert S_j \cap C_i\rvert$	fraction of trees	b_{S_j,C_i}
$j \le \frac{r}{2}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$1 - \delta$
$\frac{r}{2} < j \le \theta_i$	1	$\frac{\theta_i}{r} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{2} - \xi + \rho$	δ
$\theta_i < j$	2,4,...	π	μ
$\theta_i < j$	3,5,...	$\le \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1)$	0
$\theta_i < j$	1	$\ge \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1) - \rho$	δ

Thus, we can bound the weighted benefit (cf. Figure 4):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i} &\ge \frac{1-\delta}{2} + (\tfrac{3}{2} - \xi)\delta + \pi\mu + \tfrac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1)\delta \\ &= \tfrac{\delta+1}{2} - \tfrac{\xi\delta}{2} + \pi(\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta) \\ &= \tfrac{\delta+1}{2} - \tfrac{\xi\delta}{2} + \pi(1 - \tfrac{3}{2}\delta) =: g_1(\xi, \pi)).\end{aligned}$$



Figure 4: On the x-axis, we have the fraction of trees, on the y-axis their benefit. A lower bound for the benefit for trees S_j is given by the grey area for $j \leq \theta_i$, the green (dotted) area for $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even and the blue (lined) area otherwise.

To show (6), examine the minimum:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i}}{\pi(2-x^*(C_i)-\epsilon)} &\geq \min\left\{\frac{g_1(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} : 1 \leq \xi \leq \tfrac{3}{2},\ 0 < \pi \leq \xi - 1\right\} \\ &\overset{(*)}{=} \min\left\{\frac{\frac{\delta+1}{2} - \frac{\xi\delta}{2} + (\xi-1)(1-\frac{3}{2}\delta)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)} : 1 \leq \xi \leq \tfrac{3}{2}\right\} \\ &\geq \min\left\{\frac{2\delta - \frac{1}{2} + \xi(1-2\delta)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)} : \xi \in \mathbb{R}\right\} \geq 3.327.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the inequalities derived above. The equality $(*)$ follows by considering the partial derivative of the function in π: $\frac{\partial}{\partial\pi}\frac{g_1(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} = \frac{1}{2-\xi}\big(-\frac{1}{\pi^2}\big(\frac{\delta+1}{2} - \frac{\xi\delta}{2}\big)\big)$. This is negative for all $1 \leq \xi < 2$ and $\delta < 1$ and $\pi > 0$. Thus the minimum of $\frac{g_1(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)}$ is attained at a point where π is maximal and it suffices to consider the case where $\pi = \xi - 1$.
The last inequality is matter of computation: We just have to verify that $2\delta - \frac{1}{2} + \xi(1-2\delta) - 3.327(\xi-1)(2-\xi) \geq 0$ for $\delta = 0.126$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. The minimum is attained at $\xi \approx 1.39$.

Case 2: $\xi > \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\theta_i \leq \frac{r}{2}$ because r is even. In this case, less than half of the trees are certain to have only one edge on C_i.
Since $b_{S_j,C_i} = \mu > \delta$ for $j \geq \frac{r}{2}$ and $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even, in the worst case those indices j with $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even are as small as possible. Thus, we obtain the following lower bounds:

j	$\lvert S_j \cap C_i\rvert$	fraction of trees	b_{S_j,C_i}
$j \leq \theta_i$	1	$2 - \xi + \rho$	$1-\delta$
$\theta_i < j \leq \min\{\frac{r}{2}, \theta_i + r\pi\}$	2,4,...	$\min\{\pi, -\frac{3}{2} + \xi - \rho\}$	δ
$\frac{r}{2} < j \leq \theta_i + r\pi$	2,4,...	$\max\{0, \frac{3}{2} - \xi + \rho + \pi\}$	μ
$\theta_i < j$	3,5,...	$\leq \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1)$	0
$\theta_i < j$	1	$\geq \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1) - \rho$	δ



Figure 5: On the x-axis, we have the fraction of trees, on the y-axis their benefit. A lower bound for the benefit for trees S_j is given by the grey area for $j \le \theta_i$, the green (dotted) area for $|S_j \cap C_i|$ even and the blue (lined) area for the remaining trees.

Using the table we obtain (cf. Figure 5):

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{1}{r}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i} &\ge (2-\xi+\rho)(1-\delta) + \min\{\pi, -\tfrac{3}{2}+\xi-\rho\}\delta \\
&\quad + \max\{0, \tfrac{3}{2}-\xi+\rho+\pi\}\mu + (\tfrac{1}{2}(\xi-\pi-1)-\rho)\delta \\
&\ge (2-\xi)(1-\delta) + \min\{\pi, -\tfrac{3}{2}+\xi\}\delta + \max\{0, \tfrac{3}{2}-\xi+\pi\}\mu + \tfrac{1}{2}(\xi-\pi-1)\delta \\
&\quad + \rho(1-2\delta) \\
&\ge (2-\xi)(1-\delta) + \min\{\pi, -\tfrac{3}{2}+\xi\}\delta + \max\{0, \tfrac{3}{2}-\xi+\pi\}\mu + \tfrac{1}{2}(\xi-\pi-1)\delta \\
&=: g_2(\xi,\pi).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we distinguish two cases, depending on where the minimum in g_2 is attained.

Case 2.1: $\pi \le \xi - \frac{3}{2}$. Then $g_2(\xi,\pi) = (2-\xi)(1-\delta) + \pi\delta + \frac{\delta}{2}(\xi-\pi-1) = 2 - \frac{5}{2}\delta + (\frac{3}{2}\delta - 1)\xi + \frac{\delta}{2}\pi$. As before, we minimize

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i}}{\pi(2-x^*(C_i)-\epsilon)} &\ge \min\left\{ \frac{g_2(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2,\ 0 < \pi \le \xi - \tfrac{3}{2} \right\} \\
&\overset{(*)}{=} \min\left\{ \frac{2 - \frac{5}{2}\delta + (\frac{3}{2}\delta - 1)\xi + \frac{\delta}{2}(\xi - \frac{3}{2})}{(\xi - \frac{3}{2})(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2 \right\} \\
&\ge \min\left\{ \frac{2 - \frac{13}{4}\delta + (2\delta - 1)\xi}{(\xi - \frac{3}{2})(2-\xi)} : \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \ge 3.327
\end{aligned}$$

To show $(*)$, as before, we consider the partial derivative in π and obtain $\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\frac{g_2(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} = \frac{1}{2-\xi}\big(- \frac{1}{\pi^2}\big(2 - \frac{5}{2}\delta + (\frac{3}{2}\delta - 1)\xi\big)\big)$. Since $2 - \frac{5}{2}\delta + (\frac{3}{2}\delta - 1)\xi = (2-\xi)(1-\frac{3}{2}\delta) + \frac{\delta}{2} > 0$, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\frac{g_2(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} < 0$ for all $\xi < 2$ and $\pi > 0$, and the minimum is attained for $\pi = \xi - \frac{3}{2}$. To verify the last inequality, checking $2 - \frac{13}{4}\delta + (2\delta - 1)\xi - 3.327(\xi - \frac{3}{2})(2-\xi) \ge 0$ for $\delta = 0.126$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ is straightforward. (The minimum is attained at $\xi \approx 1.86$.)

Case 2.2: $\pi > \xi - \frac{3}{2}$. Then $g_2(\xi,\pi) = (2-\xi)(1-\delta) + (\xi - \frac{3}{2})\delta + (\frac{3}{2} - \xi + \pi)\mu + \frac{1}{2}(\xi - \pi - 1)\delta = 2 - 4\delta + \frac{3}{2}\mu + \xi(\frac{5}{2}\delta - 1 - \mu) + \pi(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\delta)$.
Minimization yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\frac{1}{r}\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_{S_j,C_i}}{\pi(2 - x^*(C_i) - \epsilon)} \\
&\geq \min\left\{ \frac{g_2(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2,\ \xi - \tfrac{3}{2} \leq \pi \leq \xi - 1 \right\} \\
&\overset{(*)}{=} \min\left\{ \frac{2 - 4\delta + \frac{3}{2}\mu + \xi(\frac{5}{2}\delta - 1 - \mu) + \pi(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\delta)}{\pi(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2,\ \pi \in \{\xi - \tfrac{3}{2}, \xi - 1\} \right\} \\
&\overset{(**)}{\geq} 3.327.
\end{aligned}$$

To show $(*)$, again consider the partial derivative in π: $\frac{\partial}{\partial \pi}\frac{g_2(\xi,\pi)}{\pi(2-\xi)} = \frac{1}{2-\xi}\big(- \frac{1}{\pi^2}\big(2 - 4\delta + \frac{3}{2}\mu + \xi(\frac{5}{2}\delta - 1 - \mu)\big)\big)$. Unlike the previous cases, this function can be positive or negative for $\delta = 0.126$ and $\frac{3}{2} < \xi < 2$ and $\pi > 0$. But for fixed ξ, it is either always non-negative or always non-positive. Therefore the minimum is either attained for maximal or for minimal π, which explains the equality.
We now show $(**)$. Let us examine the two possible choices for π. For $\pi = \xi - \frac{3}{2}$, we minimize $\frac{g_2(\xi,\xi-\frac{3}{2})}{(\xi-\frac{3}{2})(2-\xi)}$, which is the same function as in Case 2.1 (note that the terms involving μ cancel).
For $\pi = \xi - 1$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min\left\{ \frac{2 - 4\delta + \frac{3}{2}\mu + \xi(\frac{5}{2}\delta - 1 - \mu) + (\xi - 1)(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\delta)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2 \right\} \\
\geq &\min\left\{ \frac{2 - \frac{7}{2}\delta + \frac{1}{2}\mu + \xi(2\delta - 1)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)} : \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mu = 1 - \delta$, (8) equals $\min\limits_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\frac{\frac{5}{2} - 4\delta + \xi(2\delta-1)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)}\right\} = \min\limits_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\frac{2\delta - \frac{1}{2} + (3-\xi)(1-2\delta)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)}\right\} = \min\limits_{\xi'\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\frac{2\delta - \frac{1}{2} + \xi'(1-2\delta)}{(\xi'-1)(2-\xi')}\right\}$.
We replaced $\xi' = 3 - \xi$, which corresponds to mirroring at $\frac{3}{2}$. This minimum was already shown to be at least 3.327 in Case 1.
If $\mu = 3.327(2 - \xi)$, then (8) is equal to

$$\min\left\{ \frac{2 - \frac{7}{2}\delta + \xi(2\delta - 1) + \frac{1}{2}3.327(2-\xi)}{(\xi-1)(2-\xi)} : \tfrac{3}{2} < \xi < 2 \right\}.$$

To see that this is at least 3.327, it just remains to check that $2 - \frac{7}{2}\delta + \xi(2\delta - 1) + \frac{1}{2}3.327(2 - \xi) - 3.327(\xi - 1)(2 - \xi) \geq 0$ for $\delta = 0.126$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. The minimum is attained at $\xi \approx 1.86$.
This completes the proof of Lemma 13.

5 Conclusion

The approximation ratio can probably be improved slightly by choosing the $\gamma_{\hat{S}_j}$ differently, but still depending only on $\frac{j}{r}$. However, using an analysis based on Lemma 12, one cannot obtain a better approximation ratio than $\frac{14}{9}$ because the benefit can never be more than one and there can be cuts C with $x^*(C) = \frac{3}{2}$ and $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}: |S \cap C| \text{ even}} p_S = \frac{1}{2}$; therefore $\frac{\beta}{1-2\beta} \leq 4$. Our ratio is already close to this threshold.

On the other hand, it is not impossible that the best-of-many Christofides algorithm on a distribution like the one obtained in Theorem 4, or even on an arbitrary distribution, has a better approximation ratio, maybe even $\frac{3}{2}$.

References

An, H.-C., Kleinberg, R., and Shmoys, D.B. [2015]: Improving Christofides' algorithm for the s-t path TSP. Journal of the ACM 62 (2015), Article 34

Asadpour, A., Goemans, M.X., Mądry, A., Oveis Gharan, S., and Saberi, A. [2010]: An $O(\log n / \log \log n)$-approximation algorithm for the asymmetric traveling salesman problem. Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2010), 379–389

Christofides, N. [1976]: Worst-case analysis of a new heuristic for the traveling salesman problem. Technical Report 388, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh 1976

Dantzig, G.B., Fulkerson, D.R., and Johnson, S.M. [1954]: Solution of a large scale traveling salesman problem. Operations Research 2 (1954), 393–410

Edmonds, J. [1965]: The Chinese postman's problem. Bulletin of the Operations Research Society of America 13 (1965), B-73

Edmonds, J., and Johnson, E.L. [1973]: Matching, Euler tours and the Chinese postman. Mathematical Programming 5 (1973), 88–124

Gao, Z. [2013]: An LP-based $\frac{3}{2}$-approximation algorithm for the s-t path graph traveling salesman problem. Operations Research Letters 41 (2013), 615–617

Gao, Z. [2015]: On the metric s-t path traveling salesman problem. SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 29 (2015), 1133–1149

Genova, K., and Williamson, D.P. [2015]: An experimental evaluation of the best-of-many Christofides' algorithm for the traveling salesman problem. arXiv:1506.07776 (extended abstract to appear in ESA 2015)

Grötschel, M., Lovász, L., and Schrijver, A. [1981]: The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. Combinatorica 1 (1981), 169–197

Held, M., and Karp, R.M. [1970]: The traveling-salesman problem and minimum spanning trees. Operations Research 18 (1970), 1138–1162

Hoogeveen, J.A. [1991]: Analysis of Christofides' heuristic: some paths are more difficult than cycles. Operations Research Letters 10 (1991), 291–295

Oveis Gharan, S., Saberi, A., and Singh, M. [2011]: A randomized rounding approach to the traveling salesman problem. Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2011), 550–559

Sebő, A. [2013]: Eight fifth approximation for TSP paths. In: Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization; Proceedings of the 16th IPCO Conference; LNCS 7801 (J. Correa, M.X. Goemans, eds.), Springer 2013, pp. 362–374

Sebő, A., and Vygen, J. [2014]: Shorter tours by nicer ears: 7/5-approximation for graph-TSP, 3/2 for the path version, and 4/3 for two-edge-connected subgraphs. Combinatorica 34 (2014), 597–629

Vygen, J. [2012]: New approximation algorithms for the TSP. OPTIMA 90 (2012), 1–12

Vygen, J. [2015]: Reassembling trees for the traveling salesman. arXiv:1502.03715